

UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

Home About

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

In case you were confused...

As we noted in an earlier post, UCLA Health has created its own Medicare Advantage plan for those eligible for Medicare. However, the UCLA plan is NOT an option for those who are eligible for UC retiree health.

Many UC retirees may have received letters such as this one. At least 6 variants have appeared at the mailing address of yours truly. The fact that the letters say UCLA Health on the top and come at the same time that UC has its open enrollment was confusing. This blog warned its readers that if they were recipients of UC retiree health insurance, they should not sign up for the UCLA plan thinking it was an option.* Furthermore, on the reverse side of the letter shown, there is a cautionary note in small print indicating that those under any kind of employer-based group plan should not be enrolling in the UCLA plan. The UCLA plan is for individuals, not groups.



If you somehow signed up anyway despite these warnings, you will want to undo what you did.

===

*<https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/11/reminder-dont-choose-whats-not-on-menu.html>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:10 AM

No comments:



Tuesday, December 2, 2025

I never promised you a Rose Bowl? - Part 3 (Moving on edition)



Excerpt from Ben Bolch, sports columnist, [LA Times](#):

...Who's driving the proposed move to SoFi Stadium and what do the numbers look like? There's been lots of chatter about chief financial officer Steven Agostini trying to clean up the financial mess you both inherited within the athletic department. I'm assuming there have been extensive calculations

about a Rose Bowl payout and how much more money you'd make playing at SoFi Stadium.

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- [Fight for the Future of Higher Education: Academic Freedom from the Classroom to the Clinic](#)
- [Our Concerns Over Revisions to APMs 15 and 16](#)
- [Fight for the Future of Higher Ed Town Hall](#)
- [Letter from AAUP to UC Objecting to Trellix](#)
- [Judge rules Trump demands of UCLA must be made public](#)

Remaking the University

- [Liner Note 45. What Did They Do to the New School? - 12/28/2025](#)
- [Liner Note 44. The 2025 Crisis in University Management: Towards a Parallel University - 12/17/2025](#)
- [Liner Note 43. Caring for Austerity - 11/30/2025](#)

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- [Chronicle of Higher Education](#)
- [Inside Higher Education](#)
- [Remaking the University](#)
- [Changing Universities](#)
- [California Professor](#)

Search This Blog

UC Faculty Associations

- [UCLA Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSB Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSC Faculty Association](#)
- [UCB Faculty Association](#)
- [Council of UC Faculty Associations](#)

Other Faculty Organizations

- [American Association of University Professors](#)
- [California Faculty Association \(NEA\)](#)
- [UC-AFT](#)

Topics

But how much of that is SoFi spin and aren't you worried that a judge could make you pay so much in damages that the whole thing would be a net negative? Yes, you'd presumably get suite revenue at SoFi Stadium, but would anyone want to buy one given what we've seen from this football team over the last decade? Shouldn't you just go back to the Rose Bowl, football helmet in hand, and ask for a lease renegotiation that satisfies both sides?

Are you sure a big enough chunk of the fan base is on board with a move to Inglewood to justify such a jarring and abrupt abandonment of the school's longtime home? If you indeed left the Rose Bowl, how would you compensate donors who contributed major gifts to the stadium for capital improvements on the premise that the Bruins would be a tenant through the 2043 season? And why would any business entity ever feel comfortable signing a long-term lease with the school again? ...

Full column at <https://www.latimes.com/sports/ucla/newsletter/2025-11-24/ucla-unlocked-nov-24>.

NOTE: As blog readers will know, the Academic Senate is already unhappy about lack of disclosure of financial information by Murphy Hall. A screw-up in the Rose Bowl/SoFi Stadium matter could end up costing big bucks. What exactly are the projections for staying in the Rose Bowl, moving to SoFi, and for potential legal liability costs? And what about the issue - raised above - about soliciting future donations from those "who contributed major gifts to the [Rose Bowl] for capital improvements on the promise that the Bruins would be a tenant through the 2043 season"? Enquiring minds want to know.

And meanwhile:

From the [Bruin](#) (excerpt):

...The City of Pasadena and the [Rose Bowl Operating Company] alleged in their TRO application that UCLA met with SoFi representatives as early as March 2025. They also claimed that UCLA informed the plaintiffs' council Oct. 18 that it was "moving on" from the Rose Bowl...

Source: <https://dailybruin.com/2025/11/29/it-is-our-home-students-react-to-uclas-possible-move-to-sofi-stadium>.

Moving on? Seems to be the trend:



Or direct to <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKfEDZ8Htjk>.

Particularly true when you have no truck with staying:

politics (2314) UC
(2084) UC Regents
(1880) health care
(1421) State Budget
(1266) governor (1115)
UC budget crisis (964)
diversity (941) UC-
Berkeley (907) pension
(659) pensions (590)
admissions (540) tuition (531)
athletics (529) CSU (407)
transportation (391) UC-Davis
(375) online education (339)
UCOP (309) uc retirement
(304) ucrp (301) traffic (297)
audio (291) new hotel-
conference center (282) UC
enrollment (281) UC-San
Diego (259) enrollment (259)
community colleges (239) LAO
(226) UC-Irvine (183) fund
raising (168) UC-Santa
Barbara (160) UC-San
Francisco (159) UC-Santa
Cruz (156) controller (148)
faculty center (144) UC-
Riverside (140) ballot
propositions (132) CalPERS
(122) UC-Merced (115) faculty pay
(109) Master Plan (102) Yudof (90)
UCRS retirement (62) parking (61)
Faculty Association at UCLA (60)
privatization (59) CalSTRS (50) UC
Berkeley (35) copyright (35) campus
climate survey (28) UCRS (22)
Michigan Model (18) UC Merced (17) uc
funding (16) Regents (15) State
Contribution (14) UCOF (14) faculty
recruitment (12) UC pay (7) graduate
education (6) UC San Diego (5) UC Irvine
(3) UCpolitics (3) teaching evaluation (3) UC
Santa Cruz (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2025 (1139)

▼ December (93)

Our New Year's Eve
Presentation

Straws in the Wind - Part 208

The Way It Was

Subway-Related Traffic Issues
Coming in the New Year

Straws in the Wind - Part 207

Pot Boiler

No Phones - A Thought for the
New Year

Straws in the Wind - Part 206

In Dialogue or In Denial?

Straws in the Wind - Part 205

Autism Donation

Past-Present-Future

Straws in the Wind - Part 204

Don't plan on a gold watch...

Straws in the Wind - Part 203

More on the Way We Live Now

Merle Haggard - "Moving On"



Or direct to <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vYrntpZ8lfY>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:30 AM](#) No comments:

Labels: [athletics](#), [UCLA](#)

Straws in the Wind - Part 179

From [Inside Higher Ed](#): As Duke University navigates a \$108 million federal research funding freeze and multiple investigations by the Trump administration, administrators want faculty to avoid talking to the media about institutional operations, *The Chronicle*, Duke's student newspaper reported... According to an August email obtained by *The Chronicle*, Jenny Edmonds, associate dean of communications and marketing at Duke's Sanford School of Public Policy, encouraged faculty to "continue to engage with the media to disseminate [their] research as [they] have always done," while also cautioning that "media attention to institutions of higher education and discussions about institutional responses to policy changes have become more prominent than ever."



...At an Academic Council meeting in October, Duke's president, Vincent Price, and council chair, Mark Anthony Neal, commended faculty members for not speaking to a *New York Times* reporter; the reporter had visited the campus while working on a story about the Trump administration targeting Duke's diversity, equity and inclusion program...

Full story at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2025/11/26/duke-asked-some-faculty-avoid-talking-media>.

From [Inside Higher Ed](#): Hackers who attacked Dartmouth College in August stole information concerning more than 35,000 people from multiple states, according to *The Record* from Recorded Future News. The security breach was part of a larger attack by cybercriminals against Oracle E-Business Suite (EBS) software, which Dartmouth and other higher ed institutions use to manage operations. Dartmouth, which confirmed the leak to *SecurityWeek* last week, discovered in late October that hackers had obtained files that contained individuals' personal and financial details, including Social Security numbers. College administrators have since notified authorities in California, Maine, New Hampshire and Texas that residents of their states have been impacted...

Full story at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2025/12/01/dartmouth-latest-college-be-targeted-hackers>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:20 AM](#) No comments:

Labels: [academic freedom](#), [Dartmouth](#), [diversity](#), [Duke](#), [email fraud](#), [public funding](#)

All in 30 Minutes - Part 3

Klein vs. Bernardo - Part 5 (the decision)

Nathan Hale, meet Jonathan Hale

Straws in the Wind - Part 202

The Lease - Part 2

Our traditional offering for tonight

Straws in the Wind - Part 201

Brownian Movement (Toward Security)

All in 30 Minutes - Part 4

Official Winter Closure Coming

Straws in the Wind - Part 200

What goes around...

Straws in the Wind - Part 199

Advice of Irony

Straws in the Wind - Part 198

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 104

Transfers

Straws in the Wind - Part 197

Blank Check?

Another Day; Another Academic Shooting - Postscript

The Way We Live Now

Straws in the Wind - Part 196

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 103

Going Up

Straws in the Wind - Part 195

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 102

Hey, it's only money - Part 3 (Thanks, but NIL tha...

It's hard to keep a good scandal down

Straws in the Wind - Part 194

Another Day; Another Academic Shooting

I never promise you a Rose Bowl? - Part 5

Straws in the Wind - Part 193

Call for Nominations

P is for Publication

I never promised you a Rose Bowl? - Part 4

Straws in the Wind - Part 192

Brown U Shooting

The Headline

Take Note of This

Straws in the Wind - Part 191

Starts Tonight

Hey, it's only money - Part 2

Straws in the Wind - Part 190

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 101

Subway Work

Straws in the Wind - Part 189

The Regents are having yet another 30-minute meeting today about you-know-what, to which you are not invited:

November 29, 2025

TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA:

Because the membership of the Advisory Group on Research and Programs Funding Legal Issues ("Advisory Group") includes five members of the Regents' Governance Committee, there exists the potential for having present a quorum of a Regents' Committee when the advisory committee meets.

This notice of meeting is served in order to comply fully with pertinent open meeting laws.

On Tuesday, December 2, 2025, there will be a Closed Session, Special Meeting of the Regents' Governance Committee concurrent with the Advisory Group to discuss Research and Programs Funding Legal Issues

The meeting will convene at 4:00 p.m. at 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland and adjourn at approximately 4:30 p.m.

(Advisory Group members: Regents Anguiano, Cohen, Hernandez, Leib, Matosantos, Milliken, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, and Sures)

Source: <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/dec25/federal-12.2.2025.pdf>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:10 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [politics](#), [UC Regents](#)

Monday, December 1, 2025

Watch the Regents Meeting of Nov. 20, 2025



As noted in a post last Saturday, the big event of the November 18-20 Regents meetings was the approval of the cohort tuition plan on November 19. Thus, the business conducted on November 20 was more of a mopping up. There were public comments which mainly repeated themes heard on the previous two days: Opposition to a deal with the feds, support for undocumented and international

students including issues of CalFresh, funding for disabled students, divestment from military, divestment from Israel, pro-Israel, low staff morale, Teamsters negotiations, post-doc funding, ICE on campus.

Other topics included gender-affirming care, military equipment for UC police, opposition to the proposed investment in the Big Ten athletic conference and divestment from Blackstone (which - as faithful blog readers will know - got a quasi-bailout from UC in exchange for a promise of above-market returns). There may have been some confusion between Blackstone and Blackrock, two separate firms with similar names in the comments. (???) AFSCME negotiations were also mentioned.

The undergraduate and graduate students leaders both complained of lack of access to Milliken and the campus chancellors. Undergraduate complaints also included lack of access to collective bargaining sessions, lack of data on penalties imposed for protests, notification of ICE on campus. Proposals included having the newly-approved 1% surcharge on tuition go to student services and zero-cost textbooks. Graduate student complaints concerned data sharing with the feds, opposition to the tuition hike, lack of access to chancellors, a problem with Clery crime notifications, and ICE-on-campus notifications.

There was then a brief meeting of Compliance and Audit which consisted of presentation of annual and fiscal audit reports. It was noted that there is increased complexity in legal rules

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 100](#)

[Why folks are nervous - Part 2](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 188](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 99](#)

[Add On](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 187](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 98](#)

[Coming April 24th](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 186](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 97](#)

[Hey, it's only money](#)

[No News](#)

[Why folks are nervous](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 185](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 96](#)

[Just a Thought...](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 184](#)

[Calimony Money to Burn](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 183](#)

[The Elephant in the Zoom](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 182](#)

[The Forecast](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 181](#)

[Partial Restoration](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 180](#)

[In case you were confused...](#)

[I never promised you a Rose Bowl? - Part 3 \(Moving...](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 179](#)

[All in 30 Minutes - Part 3](#)

[Watch the Regents Meeting of Nov. 20, 2025](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 9...](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 178](#)

► [November \(108\)](#)

► [October \(104\)](#)

► [September \(116\)](#)

► [August \(115\)](#)

► [July \(101\)](#)

► [June \(96\)](#)

► [May \(85\)](#)

► [April \(81\)](#)

► [March \(83\)](#)

► [February \(76\)](#)

► [January \(81\)](#)

► [2024 \(832\)](#)

► [2023 \(828\)](#)

► [2022 \(719\)](#)

► [2021 \(710\)](#)

► [2020 \(914\)](#)

► [2019 \(671\)](#)

► [2018 \(595\)](#)

regarding research security with regard to certain foreign countries and companies. The Governance Committee then dealt with an executive pay adjustment and regental meeting dates for 2027. Finally, the full board reconvened to approve the various committee recommendations.

As always, we preserve Regents meetings indefinitely since the Regents have no policy on retention. The general site for the Nov. 20 meeting is at:

<https://archive.org/details/31-regents-board-11-20-2025>

The initial board meeting is at:

<https://archive.org/download/31-regents-board-11-20-2025/31-Regents%20Board%2011-20-2025.mp4>

Compliance and Audit, Governance, and the second board meeting are at:

<https://archive.org/download/31-regents-board-11-20-2025/32-Regents%20Compliance%20and%20Audit%20Committee%2C%20Governance%20Committee%2C%20Board%2011-20-2025.mp4>

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:30 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [athletics](#), [politics](#), [tuition](#), [UC Regents](#)

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 95 (An off-the-shelf observation)



Our previous post on this blog dealt with partial restoration of a library at Berkeley. But what is the library situation at Harvard?

Well, according to an article in the Harvard Crimson magazine, freshmen at Harvard are supposed to be introduced to the very large library there through a special program:

"When new students arrive at Harvard, they face not only the steep adjustment to coursework and campus life, but also the challenge that comes with navigating the world's largest academic library. To alleviate this, the First-Year Librarians program was born: an initiative that pairs groups of freshmen with a personal librarian... As librarian

*Lee LaFleur explains, the objective is to act as an "orientation lens" so that students can "learn about their new library, learn about the role of librarians in academia." But despite these ambitious goals, most first-years on campus seem unaware of the initiative..."**

Perhaps if the reporters had spent more time with the first-year librarians, they would have found that "Shelf" is not a verb.

Students Shelf the First-Year Librarian Program

The First-Year Librarian program seeks to alleviate "library anxiety," but most first-years on campus seem unaware of the initiative.

Just an impolite thought that yours truly will immediately shelf, and give them an A.**

===

*<https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2025/11/27/first-year-librarians/>.

**<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/10/06/us/harvard-students-absenteeism.html>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:25 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [Harvard](#), [miscellaneous](#)

- ▶ [2017](#) (666)
- ▶ [2016](#) (715)
- ▶ [2015](#) (765)
- ▶ [2014](#) (704)
- ▶ [2013](#) (776)
- ▶ [2012](#) (839)
- ▶ [2011](#) (738)
- ▶ [2010](#) (431)
- ▶ [2009](#) (12)

Contributors

- [California Policy Issues](#)
- [Toby Higbie](#)
- [UCLA Faculty Association](#)

Straws in the Wind - Part 178

From the [Columbia Daily Spectator](#): *Columbia is absent from the list of 38 universities facing proposed suspensions from a Department of State federal research partnership program, according to an internal memo... The memo and an attached spreadsheet indicate that the department is looking to suspend institutions from partnering with its Diplomacy Lab program effective Jan. 1, 2026, because they "openly engage in DEI hiring practices." Diplomacy Lab is an initiative between the federal government and over 60 universities that aims to harness "the expertise and fresh perspectives of students and faculty members to conduct research on key foreign policy topics," according to an information sheet about the program.*



A State Department spokesperson told Spectator that all agency programs are under review to ensure they are aligned with the priorities of President Donald Trump's administration. The spreadsheet evaluated the hiring practices of 75 universities on a 4-point, color-coded scale... Universities showing "clear DEI hiring policy" were marked red for suspension from the program, whereas institutions showing "merit-based hiring with no evidence of DEI" were marked in green.

...In its July 23 \$221 million settlement with the federal government, Columbia pledged not to consider "race, color, sex or national origin" as a factor in its hiring decisions. Columbia has also committed to submitting admissions data to the federal government, beginning with an initial October report...

Full story at <https://www.columbiaspectator.com/news/2025/11/23/columbia-set-to-retain-embattled-state-department-research-partnership-as-other-universities-face-potential-suspensions-over-dei-hiring-practices/>.

From [The Guardian](#): *More than three dozen universities including Harvard, Yale, Stanford and Duke have their participation in a federal research partnership on the chopping block after the state department proposed to suspend them over their diversity, equity and inclusion hiring practices. Last week, the Guardian obtained an internal memo and spreadsheet showing that the state department is moving to exclude 38 institutions from the Diplomacy Lab program, which pairs university researchers with state department policy offices on foreign policy projects. The suspensions would take effect on 1 January, and because the list is not finalized, the schools have not yet been informed.*

The targeted schools include elite universities such as Stanford University, Yale University, Johns Hopkins University, Duke University and the University of Southern California, as well as American University, George Washington University, Syracuse University and several University of California campuses.

Universities recommended to remain include Columbia University, MIT, the University of Michigan, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Virginia and the University of Texas at Austin. Several of these moved to comply with the administration's anti-DEI demands earlier this year – Columbia agreed in July to pay more than \$200m to the federal government and pledged not to use "race, color, sex or national origin" in hiring decisions, while the University of Virginia's president resigned in June after the justice department demanded he step down over the school's diversity practices...

Full story at <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/nov/25/us-universities-cuts-dei-state-department>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:20 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [American University](#), [Columbia](#), [diversity](#), [Duke](#), [George Washington U](#), [Johns Hopkins](#), [MIT](#), [politics](#), [public funding](#), [Stanford](#), [Syracuse U](#), [U of Michigan](#), [U of Pennsylvania](#), [U of Texas](#), [U of Virginia](#), [UC](#), [USC](#), [Yale](#)

[Newer Posts](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Posts](#)

Subscribe to: [Comments \(Atom\)](#)

